DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 885 JC 930 316

AUTHOR Doucette, Don, Ed.
TITLE Leadership Abstracts. Volume 5, Numbers 1-10, 1992.
INSTITUTION League for Innovation in the Community Coll.; Texas Univ., Austin. Community Coll. Leadership Program.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Leadership Abstracts; v5 n1-10 1992

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *College Administration; College Faculty; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Decision Making; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); *Leadership; *Leadership Responsibility: Program Descriptions; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

This document consists of a year's worth of abstracts of materials concerning issues of community college leadership. These abstracts are published bimonthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. Addressing a variety of topics of interest to community college administrators, this volume includes: (1) "The Trick to Being a Community College Chair," by Gary L. Filan; (2) "Meeting Increasing Demand Using Distance Education," by Judy C. Lever; (3) "Quality: A Business Prescription for Community and Technical Colleges," by Stanley J. Spanbauer; (4) "The Team as Hero: A Paradigm Shift in College Leadership," by Sandy Acebo; (5) "Preventing Problems in Board-President Relationships," by Gerald Bogen and Jerry Moskus; (6) "Improving Productivity in Higher Education--A Paradigm Shift Needed," by Carol A. Twigg and Don Doucette; (7) "Higher Education Finance in the 1990's: Hard Choices for Community Colleges," by Kay McClenney and James Mingle; (8) "Sound Financial Planning for Retirement: No Time To Waste for Any of Us," by J. William Wenrich; (9) "Curriculum, Culture, and Social Cohesion," by Ernest L. Boyer; and (10) "Shared Governance: Keys to a Successful Process," by Grace N. Mitchell, Ann B. Grant, and Marilyn Rossa. (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

leadership abstracts

ED358885

Volume 5, Numbers 1 - 10, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Doucette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 930 316

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

leadership abstracts

THE TRICK TO BEING A COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHAIR

Gary L. Filan

Current community college leaders—presidents, vice presidents, and deans—have come primarily from the ranks of faculty, many of whom had previously received their administrative training by serving as a department or division chair. Although the chair position is widely regarded as key to the effective functioning of a college's major academic and career programs, those filling the positions generally receive little or no formal training for the job.

Over the past decade leadership training has been designed for community college presidents, vice presidents, and deans to prepare them for their new responsibilities. Few, if any, opportunities are available to chairs, who outnumber all other types of administrators combined. Unlike the private sector, which devotes a considerable percentage of its training dollars to on-line supervisors, community colleges provide little or none to their on-line administrators. It appears the time has come for community colleges to address this need.

A National Study of Chairs

A national survey, conducted in February 1991, described key characteristics of department and division chairs in community colleges and identified training as a key need for the group. Surveys were sent to instructional officers at 1,200 community colleges in the United States. Responses were received from 426 colleges, or approximately 35 percent of all community colleges.

Organizational Structure. The organizational structures of 90 percent of responding colleges utilized division or department chairs. Department chairs were used in 30 percent of the colleges; division chairs in 37 percent; and 23 percent used a combination of both. The remaining 10 percent identified positions such as area or division dean, program directors, program chairs, department spokespersons, and faculty team leaders.

In 50 percent of the responding colleges, faculty served as chairs. Only 19 percent were classified as administrators, while 31 percent of the colleges used a combination of both faculty and administrators in the positions. One-quarter of the chairs were elected, presumably by department or division faculty following a long academic tradition of selecting a first among peers. However, 72 percent were appointed, presumably by the college administration. Other colleges filled the chair positions by both election and appointment.

Training. The principal finding of the survey was that fully 70 per ent of the respondents, representing over 300 colleges, indicated that no formalized training was provided for their division or department chairs. In addition, the great majority of all colleges—both those that provided some training for the chairs and those that did not—indicated a strong interest in training for their chairs on a wide range of topics.

In order, the areas in which respondents perceived the greatest need were faculty evaluation; strategic planning at the college, division, and department level; curriculum planning and design, especially to keep up with current trends and changing requirements; conflict management; developing and managing budgets; and negotiating the dual and often conflicting role of the chair as both faculty and manager. Other areas for which a substantial number of respondents indicated a need for training included the following: communicating with college administrators, legal issues facing chairs, time and meeting management, and implementing educational technology.

Obstacles. Despite overwhelmingly affirming the need for training for community college chairs, several respondents noted realities that make such training difficult to provide. In many colleges, chairs rotate every couple of years, thus requiring continual investment in training. Chairs are often employed only ten months per year, reducing their availability for training. Perhaps, the major difficulty is that the demands of managing their departments are so great that most chairs have little time for their own professional development.

Balancing Dual Allegiances

Respondents were also asked to identify major areas of concern regarding the chair position. Their open-ended comments helped to highlight a central problem that appears to be inherent to the position when it is filled by a member of the faculty—as up to 75 percent of community college chairs are likely to be. A defining issue for community college chairs appears to be their ability (or inability) to balance effectively the competing demands of administration and faculty.

The faculty chair sits in a precarious position straddling the proverbial fence in serving in two major roles—the middle manager/administrator and faculty member/advocate. This wearing of two hats can simultaneously

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

cause a great deal of difficulty in providing academic leadership for the department or division. Those chairs who tilt toward representing a broad-based institutional perspective are often perceived as selling out to the administration; those who tie their loyalty to the specific interests of department faculty are perceived as incapable of making tough decisions or otherwise pressing the case for improvements or changes in curriculum, teaching methodologies, or related policies.

This balancing act can be exacerbated by the presence of collective bargaining, which draws clear distinctions between those in the bargaining unit and those outside it. Chairs need to have the trust and loyalty of both parties to be effective academic leaders. However, this balancing act of "playing dual roles" is loaded with paradox and difficult to accomplish effectively, especially with little or no preparation for the position.

Importance of Training for Chairs

Department or division chairs are critical to providing instructional leadership for community colleges, but they are usually overworked and underprepared for the job. It is at the department level that the substantive operational and instructional issues get taken care of. It is the department chair who is ultimately relied upon by the administration to see that decisions are communicated and acted upon. The chair is crucial in the success of an academic institution.

The importance of training chairs for the skills needed for the position is more crucial now than ever because of the large-scale retirements in faculty and chair ranks that will occur in the next decade. As academic leaders retire, new leaders need to be developed, and the chair position is the logical focus for training for the next generation of academic leaders.

Chairs are typically thrust into positions which require considerably different behaviors from those they practiced as faculty members. Two of the most difficult aspects of the job are learning how to shift one's loyalty from a specific discipline to the institution as a whole and learning the skills to resolve conflict—between faculty in their departments, between faculty and students, between faculty and administration, and between themselves and their faculty. Unfortunately, few institutions provide any kind of formalized training to assist either their new or experienced chairs to hone these skills.

National Community College Chair Academy

Both the American Council on Education and Kansas State University provide training for department and division chairs. However, this training has been designed and centered around the needs and circumstances of chairs in four-year colleges or universities.

In this void, a grass-roots effort has undertaken the task of designing and developing training for community college chairs. A team of interested community college chairs in the Maricopa Community Colleges has reached to their counterparts across the United States to establish a national academy for community college chairs. The goals of the National Community College Chair Academy are to provide on-going training for community college chairs and their instructional officers (including certification), to develop and publish a national newsletter, to conduct research, and to disseminate information relevant to chairs about community college education. The mission of the academy is "to advance academic leadership" in community colleges through well trained and informed department and division chairs. The focus of the academy is to provide "total quality management for effective teaching and learning."

With support from its host district, the National Community College Chair Academy conducted the survey referenced in this article and organized an inaugural national conference open to chairs and their academic deans and vice presidents from community colleges throughout the United States and Canada. Plans are also underway to follow the conference with weeklong summer institutes to provide training for community college chairs that might be replicated nationwide.

The academy is a direct response to the need to prepare chairs for their difficult but critical roles in ensuring that quality instruction is provided for community college students. Its direction and ultimate success will be determined by the involvement of chairs nationwide in the design and implementation of the training they need.

Gary L. Filan is Executive Director, National Community College Chair Academy, sponsored by the Maricopa Community Colleges. For more information about the academy or its first annual conference, call or write him at Mesa Community College, 1833 West Southern Avenue, Mesa, Arizona 85202; (602) 461-7304.

The First National Conference for Community College Chairs and Deans, will be held in Phoenix, Arizona, March 25-28, 1992. Participants will be able to interact with keynote speakers after their presentations: Ernest Boyer, "Dual Role of Chairs"; Rebecca Edwards, "Legal Issues in Chairing a Department"; Mark Canfield, "Conflict Resolution and Mediation"; and Bud Hodgkinson, "Changing Demographics in Higher Education."

The majority of conference activity, however, will revolve around small-group discussion on nine concurrent session topics: legal issues in chairing departments; managing budgets; leadership styles; communicating with administrators; time management; strategic planning; curriculum design; faculty evaluation; and managing educational technology. In addition, there will be two preconference one-day workshops; "The Trick to Being a New Chair" and "Conflict Resolution, a Hot Seat."

Volume 5, number 1
January 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

MEETING INCREASING DEMAND USING DISTANCE EDUCATION

Judy C. Lever

"Doing more with less" has become a theme and core challenge facing community colleges, as well as most other educational institutions. The pressure is twofold. First, colleges are confronted with record enrollments at a time of level or decreasing revenues. Adding to the pressure is the fast expanding pool of nontraditional students requiring new and upgraded job-related skills to compete in the global economy.

Community colleges have few options. They do not have the option of limiting access to educational opportunities that have been pursued by many four-year colleges and universities. They do not have the realistic option of reducing staff if they are to meet the increasing demands of their communities. The only real option is to develop alternative methods of delivering high quality instructional programs and services to serve larger numbers of learners with existing resources. In this context, there may be no better alternative than a well-conceived and executed distance education program.

The Distance Education Alternative

Distance education has existed as an alternative to traditional classroom instruction since the mid-1800s. Early courses used the postal system to deliver printed course work, mainly to Americans in isolated rural areas. Distance education has evolved to include a collection of approaches to deliver content using various technologies to overcome the separation of teacher and learner.

The market for distance education programs has increased exponentially as the nation's social and economic structure has undergone radical change in the past decade. Out of economic necessity, most parents work, leaving little spare time after family and work responsibilities. Yet, the nature of work in an information society requires workers to upgrade their skills almost continuously. Colleges cannot keep up with the demand for courses; budgets cannot fund schedules to meet all learners' needs. Distance education has become one of the very few viable options to address these intractable problems.

Distance education can deliver instruction over any distance and without the constraint of scheduled times, thus affording flexible educational opportunities to the mother with young children, the father already working overtime to make ends meet, and the older adult without transportation. Such programs provide a learner-centered alternative to the teacher-centered traditional classroom, making the distance learning approach not only more convenient, but also more appropriate to the target audience.

Approaches to Distance Education

There are advantages and disadvantages to all approaches to delivering distance education.

Print. The oldest approach is the correspondence course, using the mail to send texts, completed assignments and graded work between students and teacher. The low cost and flexibility of print materials is the greatest advantage of this approach. Disadvantages include the lack of timely interaction between teacher and student, and the isolation of learners from each other and the instructor. Perhaps this is the greatest and most common disadvantage of most forms of distance education programs: the learner, at a distance from teacher and peers, experiences learning in isolation, and the learning experience is diminished by lack of interaction.

Audio. Radio has proven an effective replacement for print, especially in service areas with low literacy rates. It is reliable, accessible, and can be easily updated. However, radio is best for the relatively small group of learners whose dominant learning style is auditory. The learner must work at the pace dictated by the radio broadcast, again, in isolation. The audio cassette adds a self-paced, learner-controlled dimension to audio delivery, and it is low cost, easily accessible, and can accommodate lengthy and varied lessons.

The telephone adds interactivity to audio distance learning. Faculty interact with students to discuss questions, give lectures or, if conference calling is used, hold group discussions. Instructors can leave prerecorded information for students to access at their convenience, or they can call students individually. Students can also network with each other, thus reducing the isolation that too often accompanies distance learning. A new twist to the use of the telephone in distance learning is voice mail, a computer-based technology that turns sound into digital data and stores it on a computer disc for later use.

The disadvantage to all telephone approaches is the limitation of the information that can be communicated using this medium. The telephone is best for information that is reasonably concise. It works well to issue an assignment, but less well to discuss the assignment

unless previously sent in print. Also, the telephone, requires quick response and is intimidating to many.

Video. Television, both broadcast and cable, has been effectively used to deliver distance education. Using the national network of PBS stations and/or participating cable systems, instruction is delivered to individuals and groups at remote locations. Microwave transmission can also provide access to nonwired viewing sites. Television provides a better approximation of real-life instruction than most distance education approaches, and many community colleges have developed sophisticated telecourses. Unfortunately, telecourses by themselves do not provide the opportunities for interaction characteristic of the live classroom.

Two-way video conferencing partially addresses this problem, though it requires that both transmitting and receiving sites be set up with monitors and video cameras. Also, while simulation of traditional instruction is achieved, video conferencing requires students to be at a given location at a given time in order to participate, thus neutralizing one of the principal purposes of distance education programs. Video cassettes, packaged versions of telecourses, answer the need for flexibility in times and location of presentation, but they are not interactive. However, video discs, like their music equivalents, compact discs, do provide opportunity to create interactive instruction in combination with computers. Yet, video disc players are expensive and have not become as commonly available as their VCR predecessors.

Computer-Based Approaches. Computer-based approaches offer the best prospect of enhancing distance learning and overcoming the limitations of nearly all previously mentioned media. Personal computers using a modem and phone line can connect to a host computer, and learners, connected through their computers, can interact with each other and with the instructor in real time. Such approaches fall into the broad category of telecommunications, which includes electronic mail, document transmission, and instantaneous communications between learners and instructors. Perhaps even more promising is the use of electronic conferencing to encourage collaborative learning among students and instructors. A learner in physical isolation can connect by computer to one or more peers simultaneously. Together, this group can enter into a collaborative learning process; the teacher can create or join discussion groups or even hold the electronic equivalents of a traditional class or study group.

Telecommunications networks can also enhance the resources available to the class by allowing learners to access on-line services, such as electronic library catalogs, national data bases, and text and information retrieval services. Learners using a computer and modem can access resources far beyond what might have been available on the home campus. Thus, the distance education experience takes on an added dimension, not only simulating the interactivity of the traditional classroom, but surpassing it.

The disadvantages to computer-based approaches have been the cost and accessibility of equipment to learners. Drastic cost reductions in computing power have changed the situation, and the prospect is that both students and institutions will invest in the technology to make these approaches feasible.

An Integrated Distance Learning System

All distance education programs share the goal of delivering effective instruction by whatever means is necessary to accomplish the task. The best programs meet the following criteria: 1) providing learners access to instruction unrestricted by location and time, 2) facilitating learner interaction with instructor and peers, and 3) utilizing diverse formats to accommodate the learning styles and needs of their target audiences.

All approaches for delivering distance education must be evaluated both in terms of their appropriateness for their clientele and their cost. However, telecommunications represents the foundation upon which to build the most effective program. It meets the criteria of access and interactivity and provides the infrastructure to support a well-rounded program. An institution should add as many approaches as is economically feasible. Print and telephone will be included by all. Audio cassettes are feasible for most, and video cassettes are typically within the reach of most institutions. The availability of television broadcast facilities will determine whether a college can feasibly include this approach in a distance education program. Interactive television may, in the short-term, be the province of just a few institutions. The best result is a varied mix of effective delivery formats.

It may be time to move ideas around instead of people. It is probably time to invest in telecommunications infrastructure rather than to build more classrooms. This is the premise for distance education. It is time to bring the classroom to the student, time to redefine classroom parameters and build virtual classrooms that provide the familiar interaction between learners and teachers, but without the constraints of time and space.

Distance education holds the promise of providing all learners who might be served with high-quality educational programs, wherever they may be, whenever they can engage them. Technology will provide the means; innovative educators will provide the impetus. Community colleges can develop the technological infrastructure to support distance education for their communities, and then model its application in meeting the needs of increasing numbers of students. In a relatively short time, this is likely to be the most cost-effective alternative to meet increasing educational demand.

Judy Lever is director of instructional technology, Miami-Dade Community College—Homestead Campus. As a League Fellow, she is currently developing a resource directory of distance education programs in community colleges that is based upon a national survey being conducted this spring.

Volume 5, number 2
February 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

QUALITY: A BUSINESS PRESCRIPTION FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Stanley J. Spanbauer

The integration of world economies, rapidly changing technology, and increases in market competition have caused a renewed emphasis on quality and productivity in American business and industry. These changes have created an enormous need and market for training. Community and technical colleges across America have moved to address the training needs of private sector companies in their service areas, including assisting them in their quest to implement total quality management, or TQM.

Several community and technical colleges have gone one step further. They have decided that the same concepts and techniques which have been proven to be successful in business and industry can also be applied to educational institutions. They have developed a dual approach: first, applying TQM within their colleges and, second, providing training programs in TQM for business and industry. Those who have accepted the quality model for their own colleges have come to understand that this business prescription calls for new ways to operate in their institutions.

Getting Started with TQM at FVTC

Fox Valley Technical College in Appleton, Wisconsin, began the application of TQM principles in 1985, becoming one of the first institutions of postsecondary education to adopt and apply a quality model in all aspects of college operations, including both management services and instructional programs.

The journey to TQM began at FVTC when the president of a local paper company proposed that training in zero defects management be offered by the college. College leaders decided that before making a formal instructional program available to business and industry, the college needed to implement a model itself. So, the college began initial efforts based upon a single theorist's plan, but within two years, developed its own model which contains the best of the concepts found in the theories of Deming, Juran, Crosby, Conrad, and Albrecht. The singular feature of the Fox Valley model is its commitment to integrate the TQM process throughout the organization.

The purpose of the TQM model and process at Fox Valley is to create a better environment for students and employees while operating a cost-effective organization and producing job-ready graduates. The underlying rationale is that when students, staff, and employers are satisfied with the educational programs and services provided by the college, enrollments will increase, attrition rates will decline, and graduate placement rates will improve.

Implementing TQM

Implementing TQM in any organization requires a deliberate, well-coordinated plan that undertakes fundamental structural and cultural change. It requires educators to learn the language and concepts of quality and productivity from the business sector, as well as specific human resource skills, including problem-solving techniques, team-building concepts, and conflict-resolution and consensus-building skills. Administrators need to develop new leadership strategies to operate colleges with self-managing teams of faculty and staff through enablement, empowerment, shared decision making, and improved communication.

To foster these changes, colleges must flatten their organizations. They must redesign management positions and fill them with individuals who can coach faculty and staff to perform functions traditionally reserved for management. Accountability measures, complete with recognition and reward systems and professional development programs need to be individualized for each manager.

Implementation at FVTC. The gradual integration of the theories and techniques of TQM into everyday operations and management at Fox Valley Technical College has caused several things to happen:

1. A ten-member Total Quality Leadership Team, with representation from all personnel levels, has been established and given responsibility for college policies, governance, planning, and monitoring collegewide quality improvement efforts.

2. Students, employers, taxpayers, and coworkers have been clearly defined as the customers of the college. Determining their needs, measuring the college's success in meeting their needs, and working to exceed all

expectations has become the focus of institutional efforts.

3. Nine collegewide committees have been established and charged with planning professional development programs, setting up recognition initiatives, improving customer satisfaction, assisting in measurement and costing, handling corrective-action processes, and designing evaluation systems.

4. Professional development courses were designed and have provided 56 hours of quality/productivity training for the entire 660 full-time staff of the college. Additionally, training is provided to all student workers, adjunct faculty, and the board of trustees.

5. A problem-solving process which makes use of self-managed teams, scientific methods, statistical approaches and tools, and Hoshin planning techniques has been implemented throughout the college.

6. A guarantee program has been initiated which provides free retraining for graduates who do not get jobs for which they have prepared and gives refunds to employers who are not satisfied with customized training and technical assistance provided their employees.

7. External customers are routinely surveyed to determine their satisfaction with college programs and services. Research on organizational climate is conducted periodically to determine progress made in quality improvement for internal customers.

8. Quality elements have been defined in curriculum, instruction, human resource development, customer service, marketing, technology, information, and leadership. These elements with their conforming requirements serve as indicators of excellence and have become institutional standards for evaluation .

Results of TQM

More than six years of experience have demonstrated emphatically that a college can benefit from the application of business management practices and quality and productivity theory. Fox Valley Technical College is a better institution today than it was when total quality management practices were introduced in 1985; it has benefited from its commitment to continuous improvement in service to its major customers.

It has been possible to document quality improvement in student outcomes. Since 1985, job placement rates for program completers have increased to as high as 92 percent. Enrollment has increased, and fewer students now drop out. In addition, surveys have documented improved employee morale and customer satisfaction. Some unit costs have been reduced, and employees shoulder greater accountability for program quality. The college has linked its evaluation systems to the TQM process by using quality elements as indicators of success and for measurement criteria. The improvements that have been documented can be attributed to the quality processes that have been implemented.

Remaining Challenges

In addition to improving student outcomes, much has been learned about the strengths and weaknesses of the institution. Most notable has been recognizing and acknowledging the critical importance that people play in the progress and success of the college. Likewise, learning more about the organization has made individuals throughout the college cognizant that they must continually strive to achieve the highest possible quality standards.

Key challenges remain. The college will be asked to do more with fewer resources. It is already being asked to provide more students with even higher skills to remain competitive in the global economy.

A major effort will be needed to redesign the curriculum so that these same quality competencies and techniques are taught and used by students in every instructional program. Graduates must be articulate about the language and concepts of quality and must be competent in using problem-solving techniques, team-building concepts, Hoshin planning, statistical process tools, and conflict-resolution skills when they enter the private sector. The business and industry community demands this.

The reform advocated here will continue to make Fox Valley Technical College a better place to learn, teach, and provide service. The college is committed for the long haul. A major cultural change has occurred, and there is no going back to the pre-quality ways of operating. The college will continue to focus not only on outcomes but also on the continual review and improvement of all processes and transactions. By doing so, the college will establish credibility with its customers in business and industry and become a role model to students and the community in practicing the very same TQM principles which it preaches.

Stanley J. Spanbauer has been president of Fox Valley Technical College in Appleton, Wisconsin, since 1982. The case study implementation of TQM principles at the college that forms the basis of this abstract is more completely described in A Quality System for Education by the author. This and related resources are available from the Quality Academy at Fox Valley Technical College, (414) 735-5707; fax (414) 735-4771.

The author will also present selected model applications of TQM principles at "Leadership 2000," an international leadership development conference sponsored by the League for Innovation and The University of Texas at Austin held in Chicago, July 19-22, 1992. Contact the League office for registration materials, (714) 855-0710.

Volume 5, number 3
March 1992

Don Doucette editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

THE TEAM AS HERO: A PARADIGM SHIFT IN COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

Sandy Acebo

Many organizations are rethinking the way they see themselves and their employees. The quality revolution, the advent of the information age, and the pressures of international competition have created an awareness of the importance of honoring collective rather than individual accomplishment. Organizations that survive and prosper will likely be the ones that learn how to structure themselves to take advantage of the strengths of teams.

The success of community colleges may very well rest on the ability to transform the dominant leadership paradigm. While many colleges have made good progress in increasing participatory governance, power struggles and accountability issues have often ensued when the basic model of leadership has remained top-down. Success may depend upon fundamental changes in the expectations about who leaders are and what they do.

The Concept of Team

Key to a developing paradigm is the power of the team as opposed to that of the individual. Particularly in the quality movement, team building and team training are fundamentally important. The concept of a team is not at all alien. Most individuals have participated on a team at one time or another, often on an athletic team. Most report that they enjoy being part of a team, especially a successful one, and many comment on the meaningfulness of the experience. Comments about being part of something larger than themselves, of being connected, are common.

A team is generally defined as a group of people who are committed to achieving common objectives, who work well together and enjoy doing so, and who produce high quality results. In fact, the most important value of the team is that it can produce results: through the diverse talents of its members, an end product is created that is beyond the capability of the members acting individually.

Healthy Teams. A healthy team has an emotional tone of vitality and mutual enjoyment. This group energy has been called synergy, indicating that the whole is more than the sum of the parts. A mature team has learned how to handle feelings of aggressiveness, competitiveness, or hostility. Issues of control, leadership, procedures, organization, and roles have been worked out. Openness is expected, confidences can be shared, personal difficulties can be worked through, and risks can be undertaken.

Not Committees. While the concept of a team is easily grasped, and most people have experienced at least some aspect of the power of the team, the collegial setting has precious few of them. Instead, colleges generally have an abundance of committees, and committees are generally not teams—nor are academic divisions, administrative cabinets, and boards of trustees. The language of teamwork is often applied to these groups, but the behavior is something else. Pundits have made committees the butt of their jokes: Henry Cooke said that a committee is "a group of the unfit, appointed by the unwilling, to do the unnecessary;" Russell Baker added that a committee is "a mutual protection society formed to guarantee that no one person can be held to blame for a botched job that one person could have performed satisfactorily." Despite the widespread acceptance of the value and reward of working in teams, few colleges have figured out how to build and use teams effectively to accomplish results and meet needs.

Different Teams for Different Needs

One problem may be that there are many different types of teams, and most who would hope to develop teams fail to differentiate among them. Keidel, in his 1985 book, *Game Plans*, provides a detailed analysis of some of the major types of teams and the appropriateness of each to different needs. Three dominant models are those represented by baseball, football, and basketball teams. These three types are structurally and functionally quite different from one another. Distinctions among them illustrate how the term "working as a team" can have entirely different meanings to different people.

Baseball Teams. Organizations that resemble baseball teams have a common feature: their players enjoy considerable autonomy with respect to both supervision and their relations with each other. Baseball is a highly individualistic sport that calls for only occasional or situational teamwork. Coordination is achieved through the design of the game. Player management is about the management of individual heroes—of independence.

Football Teams. Football, on the other hand, demands systematic teamwork. Coordination is achieved through planning and hierarchical direction by the head coach and his staff. Player management in football is the management of dependence, of an asymmetrical relationship between planners and doers. The true hero is the coach.

Basketball Teams. In basketball, the team must be able to function as a unit without precise direction by its coach. Because of the speed and flexibility required in basketball, coordination has to come from the players themselves, as a group. The hero is the team.

Organizing for the Dominant Challenge. The best teams understand their dominant challenge and organize to meet it. Whereas the dominant challenge in baseball is to get the players right, the dominant challenge in football is to get the plan right, and the dominant challenge in basketball is to get the process right.

The strength of a football organization is its protection against high-cost failure, its crisis-response capability, its consistency, and its coherence. But in an uncertain, rapidly changing environment, the central planning of a football organization is often of limited usefulness. A football-organization approach of relying on the chain of command for integration does not work because too many things are happening at once; the hierarchy is easily overloaded. The baseball-organization approach of disregarding integration is simply too expensive because it duplicates resources. Only a basketball organization can achieve real-time integration in a dynamic environment. Therefore, the basketball model may be the most appropriate for many organizational challenges in times of rapid change.

Teamwork in Community Colleges

All three types of teams are likely to be present in any given community college. They exist within structures described by Mintzberg in his 1979 work, *The Structuring of Organizations.*

Professional Bureaucracies. Colleges are professional bureaucracies that hire trained professionals and give them considerable control over their own work. The operating core of independent professionals, the faculty, is the key structure of a college, just as it is in a baseball organization. Choosing the players is therefore extremely important, for it is impossible to have too many stars. However, a college provides even more autonomy than a baseball team. A faculty member works alone, relatively hidden from colleagues and superiors, and he or she has broad discretion over what happens behind the closed doors of the classroom.

In fact, not only do faculty control their own work, but they also seek collective control of the administrative decisions that affect them, such as hiring or promoting colleagues or distributing resources. Controlling these decisions requires control of the middle line of management, which faculty do by assuring that these positions, often division or department chairs, are filled with "their own." Much administrative work is also done by the faculty themselves, often by a plethora of committees.

The power of an effective administrator in a college or baseball team is in selecting the professionals and in helping them move their projects along, individually and in groups. Knowing that professionals want nothing more than to be left alone, the administrator moves carefully—in incremental steps with many opportunities for input from a wide variety of groups. In this way, changes may be achieved over time that the professionals might have rejected out of hand had they been proposed all at once.

Machine Bureaucracies. In contrast, support units in a professional bureaucracy, such as personnel, accounting, maintenance, and student services are likely to be managed from the top, like a football organization, or what Mintzberg calls a machine bureaucracy. Consequently, parallel structures emerge, one democratic and bottom up for the faculty, and a second top down for the support staff. In some cases, a professional orientation toward service and a bureaucratic orientation toward compliance are so opposed in nature that they create conflict in the same organization; hence, these two parallel hierarchies are kept quite independent of each other, sometimes right up to the highest levels.

Competing Styles of Teamwork. A consequence of this for the community college is that the senior management team probably contains individuals with totally different concepts of what a team means. The vice president for instruction probably sees herself as the manager of a baseball team, the vice president for student services and the business manager probably see themselves as football coaches, and the college president—if he or she is astute, is trying to meld them all into an effective basketball team! It is small wonder that this is so difficult, and small wonder that the true power of the team is so seldom realized in college leadership.

The key challenge for a college president is managing interdependence among individuals with great strengths and very different styles. Top management must function like a basketball team, or what Toffler first called an adhocracy, and it must develop other basketball teams within the organization. No other structure or team is capable of meeting uniquely modern challenges: improving quality throughout the organization, developing innovative solutions to problems, or responding quickly and effectively to change.

The adhocracy or basketball team may be better suited to extraordinary challenges than to routine tasks, yet its power is undeniable to most who have participated in a successful, results-oriented team. It is the structure best suited for environments which are becoming more complex and demanding with technical systems which are also becoming more sophisticated and highly automated. It may be the only structure now available to those who believe organizations must become at the same time more democratic yet less bureaucratic. The team may be the heart of the new leadership paradigm for community colleges—not just any team, but the adhocracy of the basketball team.

Sandy Acebo is vice president of instruction at De Anza College in Cupertino, California. She was recently selected to participate in the League for Innovation's 1992 Executive Leadership Institute, which seeks to prepare senior-level managers for the community college presidency. This article abstracts a chapter to appear in The Community College Handbook, edited by George Baker, to be published later this year by Greenwood Press.

Volume 5, number 4
April 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

PREVENTING PROBLEMS IN BOARD-PRESIDENT RELATIONSHIPS

Gerald Bogen and Jerry Moskus

Of the various metaphors commonly used to describe the relationship between a board and president—a team, a partnership, a marriage—perhaps none is more useful than the marriage metaphor. What is desired in institutional governance, as in marriage, is a relationship based on a strong commitment, mutual support, shared understanding of roles, honest communication, and trust. Dysfunction in, or dissolution of, a board-president relationship is as traumatic for an institution as conflict or divorce is for a family. In governance, as in marriage, keeping the relationship healthy over time is a demanding task, and one which can be assisted.

A substantial body of research and numerous techniques have been developed for treating or preventing marital problems, but president-board dysfunction is not well understood, seldom treated, and almost never treated preventively. However, soon after a successful external candidate assumed the presidency of Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon, the board and the president decided to engage in treatment for their relationship—before anything had gone wrong. The process they followed and the techniques they employed are available to any board and president who seek to improve their effectiveness.

Using an External Consultant-Facilitator

The key characteristic of the process used by Lane Community College was the use of a consultant as a facilitator. The incoming president felt that an outside consultant could bridge any differences of opinion and style that might exist, encourage discussion, gain clarity of need and intent, and help the board and president build consensus and focus on strategies to achieve mutual goals related to the college's mission. He also realized that there were some risks. The partners would open themselves to challenges of their own perspectives and behaviors. Also, by disturbing the status quo, a facilitator could intensify or create more problems than he or she resolved.

It is critical, then, that an external consultant have the president's trust, for the president needs to relinquish the leadership role during work sessions with the board. It is also important that the consultant not be viewed by the board as a conduit for the president. The consultant must stay closely connected to both the board and president, but remain neutral, not unlike a marriage counselor.

Charting Domains of Responsibility

Relationships between college presidents and governing boards are often fraught with ambiguity, particularly with respect to where their respective responsibilities lie. Recognizing this, the president and board engaged in a series of work sessions led by the facilitator to chart their domains of responsibility and to help identify and resolve the areas of existing or potential conflict.

At the first work session, the facilitator asked board members to list words or short phrases that reflected their recollection of board agenda items addressed over the past several years. The items were placed on large sheets of paper and displayed for all to see. Clarification and rewording of items was encouraged. Groupings resulted, and domains of board interest began to emerge.

Fifty-four agenda items were identified. Board members were asked to use the displayed lists to identify, by voting, the items they personally felt were the primary responsibility of the board. Each board member was given forty votes to distribute among the items, with multiple votes permitted for one item. Profiles and patterns began to emerge. The facilitator led a discussion about similarities and differences, which exposed a rather surprising level of disagreement among board members and between the board and president. No attempt was made to resolve the differences at the first meeting.

Response-Driven Questionnaire. Rather, the facilitator organized the fifty-four items into eight major domains: personnel management, president-board relations, community relations, fiscal management, planning, academic leadership, service to students, and management of facilities. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to board members that elicited their responses to each of the items as follows: 1) not a board matter, 2) the president should decide and then inform the board, 3) the president should discuss this with the board and then decide, 4) the president should discuss this with the board and the board will decide, and 5) purely a board matter. The president completed the questionnaire as he would wish a board member to respond to each item.

The results confirmed significant differences between the board and president, and quite frequently, among board members themselves. These were not surprising since conversation and debate at the work session had indicated that the differences existed, but the questionnaire provided explicit evidence of the disagreement

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

and identified the domains where the greatest difficulties would likely be encountered.

Responsibility Matrix. At the next work session, the facilitator presented the results of the questionnaire and began a process to reach consensus on the responsibilities of the board and president. In the discussion that resulted, the facilitator played a number of important roles: defining the issues, focusing attention, keeping the discussion moving and productive, and playing devil's advocate. Sometimes he spoke on behalf of one board member to another, or on behalf of the board to the president; often he explained the president's concerns to the board. He asked many questions. In this way, the facilitator was able to resolve differences without harming relationships among board members or between the board and the president. Gradually, a consensus emerged in the form of a responsibility matrix: the hiring of part-time instructors, for example, was designated "not a board matter," while the evaluation of the president was designated "board will do it."

Evaluating the President. One outcome of the responsibility matrix was its use as the basis for evaluating the president. The consultant drafted an evaluation instrument based upon the specific responsibilities of the president as determined by the board. Board members were asked to review the instrument, to add and delete specific items, and then to weigh their relative significance to evaluating the president. The numeric weighting helped to keep the board on task with respect to relative importance of the president's performance in each domain and to lessen the likelihood of a biased evaluation based on a temporal event. Board members were asked, for example, "How important are president-board relations compared to providing academic leadership?" Through personal numeric rating and subsequent conversation, board members reached agreement that academic leadership (9 points) was less important than president-board relations (19 points). In this way, 100 points were distributed among the eight major presidential responsibilities. Both the president and the board have been pleased with two uses of the instrument.

Using Customized Case Studies

Another technique used successfully by the board and president was facilitator-led case studies. For example, in compiling the questionnaire results, the facilitator had noted that the areas of greatest disagreement between the president and board included the selection of administrators, organization of administrative structures, and development of internal governance mechanisms. To illuminate these issues, the consultant prepared a case study about a fictional board and president in a fictional community college who were embroiled in these issues. The case studies enabled the board and president to discuss principles and particulars while minimizing personal conflicts. Each board member was asked to respond, in writing, to questions such as, "As a member of the board, what would you do in this situation? Why?" "What should the president have done?" The discussion was both lively and productive, and it resulted in further clarification of the responsibility matrix, as well as desired role behaviors.

Troubleshooting. Also, whenever the president or board chair has perceived an actual or potential problem in board-president relations, the consultant has been invited back for a "tune up" work session. For instance, the president became concerned that at board meetings the board was giving too much attention to spokespersons from the audience and too little attention to the staff and committees who had developed formal recommendations. The facilitator prepared a fictionalized case study that evoked the issue. After discussion, the matter was resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

Anticipating Issues. Most recently, the president and board chair have invited the facilitator to a work session with the board to avoid a problem that had not yet occurred but that they anticipated—difficulty in dealing with budget cuts. The facilitator presented a case study about a president who recommended budget cuts to her board. The board discussed the process used in the case, provided a critique of the activities of the president, arrived at agreement on how the budget recommendation should have been presented, and discussed the individual board member behaviors and the proper role of the mythical board. Thus forewarned by the trial run of the case study, the president will know how to develop an internal process and criteria for recommended budget cuts that can be supported by the board in the event that reductions are ever necessary at the college.

By recognizing the difficulties and ambiguities inherent in board-president relationships, the board and president of Lane Community College have developed and implemented techniques aimed at maintaining healthy rapport. By using fictional case studies and a neutral third party, they have been able to prevent conflict over roles and responsibilities and other potentially contentious issues. They have refined their abilities to discuss their concerns by creating a relatively risk-free environment in which these discussions can be honest and productive. The techniques they have used have provided the basis for these partners to maintain their successful marriage over time. It appears that even in board-president relationships: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Gerald Bogen is professor and associate dean, Division of Educational Policy & Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Jerry Moskus is president, Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon. Dr. Bogen has worked as a consultant to the board and president of Lane Community College since soon after Dr. Moskus assumed its presidency in March of 1990.

Volume 5, number 5
May 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION—A PARADIGM SHIFT NEEDED

Carol A. Twigg and Don Doucette

There is universal agreement among all sectors of American society that improving education and training is essential if the United States is to remain competitive in the world economy in the 1990s and beyond. There is also general agreement that one of the most serious problems facing the country is the seemingly inexorable rise in the cost of education, with no apparent increase in benefits. In colleges and universities, in particular, the trend is for students to be paying more and receiving less.

Educators, including community college leaders, have suggested a number of scenarios to increase the outcomes of education and training programs; most have envisioned the application of information technology to the teaching and learning process. However, there has also been nearly universal disappointment with the success of efforts to use technology to improve instruction and increase productivity. There is little consensus on educational models to apply instructional technology, and a growing chorus of leaders despair about the ability of their institutions to continue to fund requisite technology acquisition.

Yet, there is hope. A premise of the argument presented here is that the current failure to increase productivity in higher education by the application of technology can be explained. As long as technology is applied in the existing paradigm for higher education, productivity is not likely to increase; in fact, it may decrease as technology becomes an add-on cost. What is needed is a new paradigm for higher education, and the outlines of such a paradigm are emerging—one which can provide more learning for more people at lower cost.

The Inevitability of Change

There can be little doubt that the dominant paradigm for higher education is the prestigious research university. Common perceptions of what constitutes "college" invariably include sequential study for young people delivered primarily face-to-face in classrooms, usually in residential institutions that include complete lifestyle bundles. The model for higher education among political and business leaders, students and parents, and even most educators remains Harvard.

Paralysis. However, far from inspiring higher education to greater innovation, the commitment to this historic paradigm has caused paralysis. It has blinded colleges and universities to the rapid and fundamental changes taking place around them, and it threatens to keep them from responding effectively to the most basic challenge facing them all: providing high-quality and affordable postsecondary education and training to ever increasing numbers of students with stable or declining resources—serving more with less.

Yet change appears to be in the offing, if only due to the irresistible pressures of economic change. The status quo is seriously threatened when tenured faculty are laid off at institutions around the country and when heretofore sacrosanct policies of open access to community college programs are being questioned in several states. States can no longer afford to increase public subsidies to keep their colleges and universities operating; students and their parents can no longer afford spiraling tuition costs. It appears that the current model for higher education is becoming economically unsustainable.

Changing Demands. At the same time, increasing demand for postsecondary education is putting more strain on the system. In an economy where studies show that all good jobs require at least two years of postsecondary education, ever greater numbers of students are flocking to the most affordable institutions. Enrollment caps in community colleges have been instituted in some states, and the spectre of students being turned away from classes is becoming commonplace at public colleges and universities.

Fundamental change is being forced upon higher education. Its job is no longer simply to educate young adults preparing for entry into the work force; its principal task is becoming training and retraining placebound adults who are already in the work force.

Paradigm shifts are seldom voluntary. Leaders of the old paradigm community have a tremendous amount of time and energy invested in using the old rules and are resistant or blind to the need for change. However, the economic forces pressing upon higher education and other institutions of all types cannot be resisted. Fundamental change is inevitable. A new paradigm that delivers increased productivity is required, and economic conditions will force its adoption.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

The Role of Information Technology

Even though there is considerable and justifiable skepticism among educators about technological solutions to educational problems, instructional technology is routinely proposed as a means both to improve learning and to increase productivity. Admittedly, technology has so far had only limited impact on educational processes. Even more problematic, current applications of technology to accomplish existing tasks have sometimes improved outcomes but been unable to demonstrate increased productivity. Technology has become an add-on cost—something nice to do if you can afford it, but otherwise too expensive to justify increased costs.

In fact, higher education will be unable to demonstrate increases in productivity through the application of technology as long as the labor-intensive, classroom-based instructional model of the current paradigm dominates. Technology applied in the current paradigm will only increase costs. Rather, a new paradigm must be implemented that can accommodate the increased demand for education and training by the application of instructional technology. The basis for such a paradigm is the movement out of the classroom, towards technology-based delivery systems.

Models from Business. For those suffering from paradigm paralysis, convinced that higher education can not, will not, or should not change its classroom mode, it is useful to turn to business and industry to discover models that suggest alternatives for the future of higher education. In 1984, IBM discovered that it was spending nearly $1 billion on employee education and training. After a two-year study, IBM redesigned its training program, eliminated nice-to-have courses, and focused on training specifically related to the company's business requirements. It redesigned the content of its courses, with a heavy reliance on instructional design and assessment of student outcomes, and it incorporated its own technology into the delivery of instruction.

By 1989, IBM had moved fully half of its training out of the classroom to self-paced instruction; it expects to reduce classroom instruction to 25 percent of all training by the end of the 1990s. In the process, IBM reduced its per student costs from $350 per day for classroom instruction to $125 per day for satellite delivery and $75 per day for computer, video, or print-based independent study. A paradigm shift had been accomplished and increases in both student outcomes and productivity had been documented.

An Emerging Alternative Paradigm

An alternative paradigm for higher education is emerging. Rather than trying to automate the old model, new models are being developed and implemented, primarily in institutions that are responding effectively to the new majority of higher education students—placebound and timebound adults.

The underlying commitment of the new paradigm is to universal access to lifelong learning. Its methodologies are diverse, though they have in common alternatives to classroom-based instruction. Distance learning is a primary mode for education and training, and instructional technology is at the heart of alternative delivery systems. In its emerging forms, this delivery system depends upon an electronic network infrastructure that provides communications and interactivity among faculty and students, remote access to campus-based instructional resources and other digitized data bases worldwide, and independent learner-centered instructional systems.

Faculty Roles. Most of all, however, this paradigm shift depends upon changes in the role and work of the faculty who remain central to the instructional process. Rather than continuing in their role as the "sage on the stage," faculty are redefined as developers of curricula, planners of educational experiences, and managers and facilitators of student-directed learning. Far from being eclipsed in the new paradigm, faculty roles become more sophisticated and professionally fulfilling.

Funding Technology. Underlying the entire paradigm is the question: In an era of extremely tight resources, how does one fund the necessary investment in technology this model requires? The answer lies in the changing roles of the faculty. Necessary infrastructure is funded by increases in faculty productivity, that is, by increased student outcomes per faculty input. The economics of the alternative paradigm are based upon serving more students, more independent learners, without corresponding increases in the number of faculty. In fact the model depends upon faculty who are better compensated and better supported than the current paradigm now allows.

Far from fantasy, this new paradigm is at the heart of not only the strategic plans of a growing number of community colleges, but also of the business plans of major international corporations. The current model of higher education will inevitably change because it is economically unsustainable. In its place, for the vast majority of students, will be colleges and universities that provide the infrastructure to support lifelong learning and guidance in its use.

The key to success is the transformation of the teaching and learning process from one that is teacher-centered to one that is learner-centered, to transform the paradigm of the "community of scholars" to one that is defined by "communities of learners." Still, shifting from a system of higher education in which the learner replaces the faculty member at the center is equivalent to replacing the earth in the center of the Ptolemaic universe with the sun of the Copernican.

Carol A. Twigg is associate vice president for academic programs and information technology at SUNY Empire State College. Don Doucette is associate director of the League for Innovation in the Community College. *This abstract is based upon companion pieces by the coauthors published this summer in* CAUSE/EFFECT *(v15n2), a periodical of CAUSE, an association for information technology management in higher education.*

Volume 5, number 6
August 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCE IN THE 1990S: HARD CHOICES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Kay McClenney and James Mingle

Across the nation, higher education institutions and state agencies are dealing with a complexity of issues that will make the decade of the nineties very challenging. Three factors seem particularly salient: high expectations for education, growing public distrust of institutions, and concern about the future.

High expectations are expressed by a variety of leaders, including governors and corporate CEOs, as well as in a variety of highly publicized reports and initiatives, including *America's Choice*, SCANS, National Education Goals, and the America 2000 initiative. All of these people and reports look to education for solutions to major economic and social problems.

Growing Public Distrust of Institutions

Growing distrust, and resulting disengagement, is particularly focused on government, but also includes higher education. It is fed by a general disconnection of the public from politics and public affairs. Evidence of this disconnection comes from antitax referenda, appallingly low levels of voter turnout, incumbent officeholders being unseated, and the Perot phenomenon. Distrust is also fed by criticism of higher education's perceived shortcomings and real scandals. Every time there is a story about mishandling of public funds, about big salaries for top officials, or about self-interested politics, the public grows more cynical.

There is a growing gap, now well-documented by Yankelovich and others, between what experts think and what the general public thinks about a host of topics, including the connection between education and the revitalization of the work force, economic competitiveness, and the quality of life. Public distrust is fed by other gaps, such as the gap between rhetoric and behavior on issues like equity (when access is being reduced) and student-centeredness (when tuition goes up and services go down).

Concern about the Future

These factors—high expectations ironically mixed with growing distrust—are also mixed with more than a little fear about America's declining economic and educational status in the world. The dilemma is that the challenges of meeting the expectations of society are coming at a time when costs are on the rise and traditional sources of support—state tax dollars—are shrinking. How to respond to this dilemma is a principal agenda item before most community college leaders.

Why are higher education leaders caught in this vise? Is it because the case for higher education has not been made forcefully enough? Is it because of a temporary downturn in the economy? Is it because community colleges are victims of their own success? Or is it because of the build up of long-term problems which may call for fundamental changes in the way community colleges do business? Recent data may help answer these questions.

Revenue Trends

Despite fears at the beginning of the 1980s higher education did very well. Support from state and local governments sources doubled during the decade, rising in real terms over inflation by nearly 27 percent. Even accounting for growth in enrollment, this represented real increases on a per student basis. Income from virtually all other sources also rose.

This information is known also to policymakers, of course, and it raises for them certain natural questions. What did institutions do with all that money? Where did it go? The short answer may be that the money went for a lot of salary catch-up, for increases in administrative costs, for new programs and services added in response to external demands. The great preponderance of this was done without fundamentally changing the production process or the academic structure.

However, the 1980s are history, and the 1990s appear to be a different story. For the first time in the 33-year history of collecting data on state appropriations, the fall 1991 *Grapevine* report showed an actual decline in the total dollars appropriated by states to higher education last year. For a survey that has usually reported 8-10 percent annual increases, this was big and disturbing news.

Declines in state support were primarily in the south and northeast. But this year's map will show the effects of the recession spreading across the country. More than half of the states reported 1991-92 mid-year cutbacks from the money previously appropriated, as well as extremely tight appropriations for the 1992-93 year.

Many people believe that this decline in state support for higher education reflects a failure of leadership—that presidents, boards, and governmental relations staffs have failed to make an adequate case. Others believe that it represents public backlash. Far more likely is that the decline in state support reflects hard economic and political reality. As one chancellor of a state system put it, "We've got all the public support for higher education we need. What we don't have in this state is any money."

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Recent Trends in Appropriations

Although data available from Ed Hines' *Grapevine* series on state appropriations has a number of significant limitations, partial data on appropriations to community colleges in 34 states provides important insights for 1990-91 and 1991-92 academic years.

Community colleges in 14 of 34 states experienced decreases over the two-year period; community colleges in 20 of the 34 states experienced increases. The good news was that community colleges fared substantially better than higher education as a whole, that is, a 12.5 percent gain across the 34 reporting states for fiscal year 1991-92, compared to 2.5 percent for all of higher education. Thus, the increase in state support to community colleges was five times greater than to higher education as a whole. Only in 8 of the 34 states was support for community colleges smaller than the percentage increases for higher education generally.

The bad news was that support did not keep pace with enrollment growth. In many settings, community college appropriations per FTE have declined. One consequence of this situation is that public two-year colleges tuition went up 13 percent in 1991-92—the biggest increase in one year since The College Board began compiling the figures, and the largest increase of any sector in higher education.

The growth in state appropriations in the 1980s obscured one trend which is now having a major impact as total tax dollars decline, namely, that higher education's total share of the state budget has been shrinking. Higher education is now clearly competing with other public priorities. A comparison of state spending relative to personal income in 1976 and 1990 reveals declines in education spending and dramatic increases in Medicaid, corrections, and interest paid on state debt. From the typical legislative perspective, higher education is a well-fed child who has now grown up and can eam its own way in the world. One consequence: some public colleges and universities have increased tuition as much as 25, 30, and even 40 percent over the past two years.

Hard Choices Ahead

Given these circumstances, college leaders' choices are limited, and they are all hard.

Colleges can "do more with less." This strategy is the clear predisposition of access-oriented, comprehensive, come-one/come-all, can-do community colleges. Using this approach, within existing or declining resources, colleges would work on improving faculty and student productivity, for example, by increasing teaching loads and class sizes, employing more part-time faculty, offering programs and courses consortially, and encouraging students to take larger course loads. They would cut administrative costs and streamline operations—a now-favored strategy of corporate America and TQM. Colleges will also find ways to use technology to meet needs in less labor-intensive or more cost-effective ways and to reallocate funds from low to high priority areas

Colleges can "do less with less." Under this strategy, colleges would cap enrollment and cut programs and services or whole components, for instance, residences, athletics, and performing arts. Some colleges would offer fewer sections, extending the time it takes students to complete programs and graduate. Some would attempt to offer programs contingent on being self-supporting, for instance, only those technical programs provided by contract with business and industry.

Sometimes, indeed, less is better—but not always. There may be some, including elitists on the faculty and conservatives in the legislature, who already think that there are too many people in college who do not belong there anyway. It would be a shame if the result of fiscal belt-tightening is smaller and more efficient, but also more socially irrelevant community colleges—leaner and literally meaner institutions.

Colleges can try to win the intergovernmental competition. Leaders can work hard at convincing legislators that community colleges are more important than health care, crime, highways, and public schools. It would be a divisive and bloody zero-sum game, and the struggle could be more than a little schizophrenic for most community college people.

On one hand, good arguments can be made about the crucial role of community colleges in prevention and intervention in the cycles of poverty, unemployment, dependency, and despair. On the other hand, who would want to be the one to make the argument that support for community colleges is more important than prenatal care, childhood nutrition and immunizations, expanded Headstart, and improvement in the deplorable conditions that exist in many urban schools?

Colleges can seek alternative sources of revenue. The potential sources of alternative revenue at the institution level include student tuition and fees, foundation dollars, business and industry contracts, employer and employee taxes, endowments, and community trusts. Colleges could seek to enhance these sources of revenue, though several, such as sharp increases in tuition, could have undesirable consequences.

Colleges can fundamentally restructure themselves. Across corporate America and, increasingly, across the public school systems, are examples of organizations, institutions, and even systems that are redesigning themselves in fundamental ways. These efforts tend to be characterized by emphasis on highly focused missions and a keen sense of vision and priorities. Key principles include reduction of bureaucracy, regulatory burden, and hierachical management; decentralization and empowerment of individuals and teams closest to customers and students; and accountability for results, coupled with flexibility in designing the means for achieving them.

These are the same choices that will face virtually all organizations, both public and private, for the remainder of the decade. The nature of higher education—perhaps especially the character of community colleges—will be shaped by the hard choices which must be made. The rest of this decade must be a time for serious reflection, and then action, on these key issues.

Kay McClenney is vice president of the Education Commision of the States. James Mingle is executive director of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). Charles Lenth, director of the SHEEO/NCES Communications Network, also contributed data for this abstract.

Volume 5, number 7
September 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

SOUND FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR RETIREMENT: NO TIME TO WASTE FOR ANY OF US

J. William Wenrich

Most community college educators do not worry about the financial security of their retirement years—even though they should. The assumption many make that the "system" will provide for them often blocks realistic assessment of future resources versus future need, often until they are within a few years of retiring. This is not an inconsequential matter since half or more of all current community college faculty, administrators, and staff are projected to retire in this decade.

Unfortunately, many college faculty and staff simply do not know whether available resources will be sufficient to meet retirement needs—and, far too often, they will not. However, by understanding both the benefits and the limitations of typical college retirement programs and by applying a simple formula to project the impact of negative influences such as inflation, it is possible for any individual to take a realistic fiscal snapshot that will help to plan for the retirement lifestyle each wants and deserves.

The tendency among educators to become complacent about retirement planning is understandable. After all, the college or state has a retirement program which theoretically will provide sufficient income when the time comes. Many may also be covered by Social Security in addition to institutional or state retirement programs. Still, a quick analysis of these typical programs proves they may not be the financial safety net many suppose them to be. Educators need to be intentional about their futures, for financial planning for retirement is a lot like a favorite definition of a budget: telling your money where to go instead of wondering where it went.

Kinds of Retirement Programs

Most full-time, contract employees of public community colleges participate, through their institutions, in one of two kinds of retirement programs.

Defined Benefit. The first type of retirement system is a defined benefit system, typically administered by the state and funded by both college and individual employee contributions. The defined benefit a retiree ultimately receives is a result of the number of years worked, times some measure of the highest average salary earned—often calculated over a three- or five-year average. Each year worked is usually worth somewhere between 1.5 and 2.0 percent of the highest average salary. This percentage is often related to whether or not employees in the program are required to participate in the Social Security system.

With a defined benefits approach, employees are usually vested to receive benefits after participating in the program for five years. This vesting simply guarantees a monthly or annual income, or perhaps an accumulated principal which may be withdrawn. This principal is usually only the employee's accumulated contribution plus interest, which may make the plan less valuable in the long run than the defined contribution program.

Defined Contribution. A defined contribution program, the second kind most often available to community college educators, is also funded from contributions by institutions and employees but does not guarantee a benefit level at retirement. Instead, contributions are applied to an employee's individual account, which is immediately vested, and the retirement income depends on the amount of money accumulated in the individual employee's account.

Under a defined contribution program, the employee may elect to place the principal in an annuity and receive a guaranteed monthly or annual income, or dispersion of the principal may take other forms upon retirement. For example it may be rolled over into an individual retirement account (IRA).

In both the defined benefit and the defined contributions programs, if the principal is annuitized, the amount of the monthly or annual income will decrease to the extent that the retiree uses alternate payment programs which stretch out guaranteed income over a period of years, or which continue payments to the spouse after the retiree's death.

Uncertainties in Planning for Retirement

Uncertainties about future assets greatly complicate retirement planning. Major uncertainties include the health of the federal Social Security system and the effects of inflation.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Social Security. The validity of including Social Security contributions in retirement planning is problematic, at best, and is tied closely to the number of years left until retirement. In fact, an increasing number of prudent planners who are a considerable number of years from retirement simply do not factor Social Security into the equation at all. As the federal deficit swells and entitlement programs come increasingly under attack, the likelihood of reduced Social Security payments increases, especially in the face of increasing longevity and the demographic aging of the U.S. population is not beyond imagining. It is not at all far-fetched to believe the retiring "baby boomer" generation may eventually face bankruptcy of the federal system. Reductions may also occur in other retirement payments received or from income earned while in retirement.

Inflation. Inflation, of course, is the *bete noire* of income security. Or as one wit aptly put it, "Inflation can make the green pastures of retirement look parched." The average educator retiring at age 65, 60, or earlier can expect to live another 20 years. If income is annuitized and fixed, the current value of payments can be cut in half–or be reduced even more–by inflation over that time.

The Rule of 72. An easy-to-calculate formula called the "Rule of 72" gives a quick approximation of inflation's effect on current value of income. Under the Rule of 72, when you divide the estimated rate of inflation into 72, the quotient will be the number of years it takes to reduce the current value in half. For example, an annual inflation rate of four percent would mean that $10,000 today would have only $5,000 in purchasing power 18 years from now. The value of current retirement income is under major attack when inflation rises to double digits, as it did in the early 1980s.

Solutions: Tax-Sheltered Annuities

However, community college educators have at least one high-powered weapon in the battle against income erosion. A major tax incentive—and perhaps the last major financial fringe benefit—is the tax-sheltered annuity plan. Such plans offer the opportunity to deduct payments from current income without paying taxes on either the income or the interest it generates— an important leg up in supplementing retirement income.

TSAs can provide a margin of retirement income above either defined benefit or defined contribution plans that can safeguard the retirement standard of living desired. The Rule of 72 works positively in TSA accumulations so that money doubles in the number of years as a factor of 72 divided by the interest rate. Obviously, the earlier one begins accumulating funds in a tax-sheltered-program, the heftier compounded interest and principal will finally be. Also, because TSA contributions are limited to $9,500 per year, employees must begin contributions early in their careers to ensure that TSAs are more than a minor income supplement.

However, educating employees early enough to enable them to put the principle of tax-free interest to work for them can be a problem. Representatives of insurance companies, financial planning agencies, and other financial institutions are usually eager to come on campus to talk about this investment vehicle. However, they may represent only one company, or they may charge a fee for their services. Under these conditions, educators are often skeptical or turned off altogether to this valuable financial option.

Educating Employees

Given the stakes—nothing less than the financial viability of long-valued employees—colleges have a responsibility to assist employees in planning for their retirement years. Not only do the large numbers of community college faculty and staff who will retire in the next ten years need immediate help, but even younger employees can also benefit significantly by such planning.

Colleges should offer staff development workshops for all employees that include a review of how the institution's particular retirement program is structured, the limitations of the retirement plan, discussion of Social Security, analysis of retirement medical costs, and tax-sheltered program options.

Because tax-sheltered income is one of the last remaining—and one of the most significant—financial benefits for educators, community college leaders should make sure employees are fully informed concerning the advantages of early participation in tax-sheltered annuities. Workshops on TSAs sponsored by the college can provide necessary retirement planning information that is insulated from the self-interest of any individual selling particular financial products. Also, where possible, colleges should structure their compensation and benefit systems to allow employees to contribute to individual tax-sheltered plans through payroll deductions.

Just as a college is concerned about its employees and their welfare while on the job, it should be equally concerned about their welfare at the end of years of dedicated service. Better information, presented earlier, will help people make intelligent decisions about their financial future in retirement.

J. William Wenrich is chancellor of the seven-campus Dallas County Community College District in Dallas, Texas. He has been a CEO for four other colleges and universities in California and Michigan.

Volume 5, number 8
October 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Community College Leadership Institute. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

CURRICULUM, CULTURE, AND SOCIAL COHESION

Ernest L. Boyer

Educating students in a multicultural world means affirming the sacredness of every individual, celebrating the uniqueness of every culture, and acknowledging the non-uniformity that separates one person from another, the distinctiveness that makes us who we are. This is the centerpiece of education in a multicultural world.

But there is another side to the equation. In our deeply divided world, students also must begin to understand that while we are unique, we do share many things in common. While we celebrate individualism in education, it is immensely important that we celebrate community, as well, and that we begin to understand the commonalties we share.

Several years ago in a book called *Quest for Common Learning*, Art Levine and I suggested that we organize the core curriculum in the nation's colleges and schools not on the basis of the disciplines, but on the basis of what we call the human commonalties—those universal experiences that are found in all cultures and among all people on the planet. We concluded that there are, in fact, eight fundamental characteristics that bind us altogether, and that as students study these commonalties, they can begin to learn not only about their diversity, but about the human community, as well.

Human Commonalities

1. The Cycle of Life. At the most basic level, we all share the universal human experience of birth and growth and death. It is so simple, so essential, yet so forgotten. The life cycle binds us all together, and the sad truth is that most of us go through life without reflecting on the mystery of our own existence, not understanding conception, not considering the sacredness of our own bodies, not learning about how to sustain wellness or pondering the imperative of death.

Above all else, we share the mystery of birth and growth and death. Educating in a multicultural world means not only having students learn about the life cycle we all share, but also helping them to discover how these most basic human experiences differ among cultures.

2. Use of Symbols. All people on the planet use symbols to express feelings and ideas. Our sophisticated use of language sets human beings apart from all other forms of life, and it is through the use of words that we are connected to each other.

The use of symbols is what makes us truly human; it is also the glue that holds us all together. It is the only vehicle we have to define who we are and where we fit.

So, I would like to see a core curriculum in which students not only study the parts of speech, but also how language profoundly shapes our lives. I propose that all students be required to complete a course in expository writing and oral discourse, and that all be required to write an essay on a consequential topic to test their capacity to think critically and integrate ideas. I suggest, as well, that all students be asked to complete a course on the ethics of communication—a seminar where the use and abuse of language can be considered, where political debates are carefully critiqued, and where the integrity of one's own discourse is thoughtfully confronted. Finally, I would like to see every student in the United States study a language other than their own, since foreign language study helps students discover the richness of other cultures and traditions.

3. The Aesthetic. All people on the planet respond to the aesthetic. This is a universal language that can transcend the words we use and bring us evocatively together. Just as you can make connections in another culture by taking along a baby, you can make connections by taking along a guitar, a harp, or a violin. The symbol system and the magic of the arts need no interpreters; they establish their own bonds across the cultures that too often are divided.

Dance is a universal language, architecture is a universal language, music is a universal language. Painting and sculpture are languages that can be understood all around the world. For our most intimate, most profound, and most moving experiences, we turn to music, dance, and the visual arts to express feelings that words cannot convey. This is true of all people on the planet, and in a multicultural world, we must celebrate the universal language of the arts.

4. Awareness of Time. All people on the planet have the miraculous capacity to recall the past and anticipate the future. We are, in fact, so far as we know, the only species on the planet that can put itself in time in space. T. S. Eliot wrote: "Time present and time past are both present in time future, and time future is contained in time past." And yet how often we squander this truly awesome capacity to look in both directions.

Educating in a multicultural world means asking students to study both the richness of their own heritage and the richness of other cultures. Critics of

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

multiculturalism insist that this will lead to a diminished respect for Western heritage. I disagree. Multiculturalism at its best is not an attack on anyone's ideals. It is a simple recognition that in a nation as diverse as ours, we must respect the differences of other people while also acknowledging that the world is becoming more interdependent every year. All students should study Western culture to understand our past, and they should study non-Western cultures to understand our future.

5. Social Bonding. All people on the planet are members of groups and institutions that consequentially shape their lives. Nearly 150 years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson observed, "We do not make a world of our own. Rather, we fall into institutions already made and we have to accommodate ourselves to them." Some we are born into, others we join. But no matter how you slice it, we are all caught up in the web of groups and institutions by the dozens, or even by the hundreds. Every society organizes itself and carries on its work through groups and institutions, even though, of course, specific practices vary dramatically from one culture to another.

Our son Craig lives in a Mayan village in the jungles of Belize with his Mayan wife and three children. When we visit Craig each year, I am impressed that Mayans and Americans—who may be separated by a thousand miles and a thousand years—still carry on their work in very basic ways. The Mayans have family units, elected leaders, village councils, law enforcement officers, jails, schools, and places where they worship, just as we do. In all of this, they are very different, but also very much alike. I would love to see students do a paper comparing Santa Cruz, California, with Santa Cruz, Belize. There are, after all, groups and institutions that we share.

6. The Ecology of Our Earth. We are all connected to the ecology of the planet Earth. We are all embedded in nature as working parts, as Lewis Thomas puts it. David, my three-year-old grandson in Belize, understands his connectedness to nature very well. He knows that he is connected to the natural world. He cannot escape it. He survives on it every single day. But David's cousins who live with appliances and asphalt in Boston and New Jersey find it enormously difficult to discover the fundamental truth that they, too, are connected to the natural world, and their future also is embedded in the ecology of this planet. Every single one of us is inextricably connected to the natural world, and our very survival on this planet increasingly will depend on our ability to respond sensitively to the earth home we share together.

7. The Universality of Work. All people on the planet produce and consume. Work is universal; it is something we all do. Students need to understand that if they are consumers, they also need to be producers. Perhaps the most offensive place in the United States for an impatient grandfather is a toy store. The cornucopia of junk goes from the floor to the stars. There are aisles upon aisles of objects that someone has produced, and children don't know how. They see no connection between production and consumption.

Children grow up not knowing that people work in order to live. The connectedness has been broken. "What work do mommy and daddy do?" is hardly a relevant question to many children in our world. I cannot overstate the case that young people must understand the processes of production and consumption and know that these are found in every culture. In fact, I would suggest that students study culture through the prism of work: Who works? What work is prized? What do women do compared to men? You can understand a culture through production and consumption and make wonderfully interesting cross-cultural comparisons.

8. Search for Larger Purpose. Finally, all people on the planet, regardless of their heritage or tradition, are searching for a larger purpose. There is in all of us an attempt to give meaning and spiritual direction to our lives. So we go from birth to the search for meaning. Reinhold Neibuhr put it precisely when he said, "Man cannot be whole unless he be committed. He cannot find himself unless he find a purpose beyond himself."

In our search for education in a multicultural world, we must understand that all people on the planet seek to give meaning and purpose to their lives. There should be an inquiry into the value systems of different cultures throughout time, and a study of religion, which has been so powerfully a part of our search for meaning. In my judgment, that would give some sense of understanding, so that we see this search for meaning not as a reason for war, but as a reason to understand the shared need for a sense of purpose.

I am suggesting that while we are all different, we are at the same time alike. We are all born, we live, we die. We all send messages to each other, we all respond to the aesthetic, and we all recall the past and anticipate the future. We are all inseparably a part of nature, we are all engaged in producing and consuming, and we all seek to give meaning to our lives.

Would it be possible in the twenty-first century to stop organizing the curriculum around these dreary and outdated academic subjects, which scholars themselves no longer find very useful? Can we begin instead to organize learning around human commonalties so that students would not study subjects but would study themselves. They would use academic subjects to illuminate larger, more consequential ends? They would not only discover human commonalties; they would discover the different ways in which humans around the world express the commonalties we share. And in so doing, academic subjects would be put toward larger ends. We would make education applicable to the student, and we would teach about multiculturalism within a larger context of common ground.

Ernest L. Boyer is president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This manuscript is abstracted from a transcript of his written remarks delivered at "Leadership 2000," July 22, 1992, in Chicago. The 1993 "Leadership 2000" conference will be held July 18-21 in Washington, D. C.

Volume 5, number 9
November 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Community College Leadership Institute. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper

leadership abstracts

SHARED GOVERNANCE: KEYS TO A SUCCESSFUL PROCESS

Grace N. Mitchell, Ann B. Grant, and Marilyn Rossa

In the fiercely competitive world of international business, participatory management has become accepted as key to corporate organization and effective decision making. However, despite its proud tradition of faculty involvement in institutional governance, higher education has lagged behind business in establishing viable models for successful shared decision making.

"Shared governance," the collegiate counterpart to participatory management, includes the institutional structures and processes for decision making and communications that engage an institution's faculty, staff, and administrators in governing the organization collectively. Shared governance can be developed and effectively implemented at any educational institution, but only if care is taken from the beginning to understand, nurture, and maintain the integrity of the process.

Following the passage of reform legislation in 1988, all California community colleges were required to develop and implement shared governance. Success has varied widely from campus to campus throughout the state, but examining one successful model provides insight into the elements that appear necessary to effective implementation of shared governance.

Developing Shared Governance

Interest in shared governance at Cuesta College in San Luis Obispo, California, actually predated the legislative mandate, and a stated expectation for the newly appointed college president was to develop and implement a model sensitive to local institutional dynamics. Rather than restructuring the entire institutional governing structure, a consensus was reached to implement shared governance within the existing framework.

The first step toward shared governance at Cuesta College was the delineation of the roles, responsibilities, and relationships among all of the major committees involved in governance at the college. This involved a careful review by the president in cooperation with the Academic Senate of the decision-making processes at the college and the way that decisions were communicated among various constituencies. A result of this review was the publication of Principles and Procedures, which spelled out in writing the specific responsibilities of all committees and the relationships and formal channels of communication among them. In retrospect, it is clear using existing committees proved much more useful in developing effective communication structures than starting from scratch or imposing a new structure.

The next step was to develop a formal planning and budgeting process that could be the center of the college's model for shared decision making. In this case, a planning process needed to be developed from scratch. A new, broadly representative Planning and Budget Committee was formed and charged with both long-range planning and fiscal decision making. The eighteen-member committee is comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators and chaired by a faculty member. Its principal purpose is to tie budgeting to consensual planning goals, and it meets frequently to develop and revise the college's budget based upon input from all college constituencies.

Each year the committee develops a priority list of budget recommendations—for acquisitions when funds are available and for reductions in times of cutbacks. Its effectiveness was demonstrated during the most recent state budget crisis when the committee cut $1.5 million from the college's $24.3 million operating budget but received collegewide support because of the inclusive nature of this shared governance process.

A Disposition for Shared Governance

Shared governance requires a change in the way that faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the board of trustees view decision making. All must be willing to let go of notions that place decision making in the province of a central authority. They must accept the notion that all college constituents have a stake in the decisions of the organization and share in the responsibility involved in making them. Those in positions of power need to let go of their concentrated authority, and those newly participating need to look at problems and solutions from a collegewide perspective.

Part of the required disposition for shared governance is a willingness to agree to reach agreement. Participants must be willing to make a commitment to reach a resolution, to come to a consensus when the time or situation calls for it. This allows an honest effort to incorporate everyone's beliefs while ensuring that there will be general support for final decisions even if complete agreement of all parties cannot be reached.

Successful shared governance process also depends on a willing "suspension of disbelief," the abandonment of commonly heard verbal obstacles: "It can't possibly work;" "The administration would never give up that much power;" "Faculty don't have the big picture." All parties must agree to work within the system with the assumptions that shared governance will work, and that it is an ever-evolving process.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Finally, shared governance depends upon trust, a trust that is best built upon positive experiences with the process and a sincere conviction that the advantages of having the best minds collectively steer a course for the college far outweigh any disadvantages, real or imagined.

Keys to Shared Governance

Once committed to shared governance, a college needs to develop appropriate structures and processes for decision making and communication, including informal consultation and formal evaluation. Shared governance cannot function without constant and effective communication. Widespread sharing of information among all parties is also necessary to establish a clear, collective vision of the college's purpose, which, when articulated in a collegewide plan, serves as a guide for action and for assessment of progress toward goals.

Structures and Processes. At Cuesta College, a key to the success of its shared governance structure has been a careful delineation of the roles and both the decision-making and consultative responsibilities of all committees, especially those involved in critical decisions related to planning, budget decisions, educational practices and policies, and college operations.

Planning. The Planning and Budget Committee oversees the development of the College Plan, a basic planning document that serves as the blueprint for all college decisions. It includes the college's mission and values statement, as well as planning assumptions, goals, and activities. All other committee and management plans must be based on the College Plan.

Budget Decisions. The responsibility for budgetary decisions also rests with the Planning and Budget Committee. Each fall, all units of the college develop unit plans and budgets for the subsequent year based on the College Plan and the results of their own program reviews. These are consolidated into cluster plans which are then forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee for review and recommendations to the board of trustees. Because the committee includes the president and three vice presidents of the college, its recommendations undergo no further review and go directly to the board of trustees; all disagreements are resolved at the committee level.

Educational Practices and Policies. Proposals for changes in educational practices and policies must be agreed on by the Academic Senate and the President's Cabinet before presentation to the board of trustees for review and approval. Proposals may be initiated by a variety of college committees, and Academic Senate committees frequently make proposals regarding academic matters, including professional standards, faculty evaluation, tenure, or other procedures or policies.

College Operations. Under shared governance, supporting day-to-day operations is the work of many college committees. Yearly goals are established, and committees are asked to take responsibility, together with an appropriate manager, for working toward their accomplishment. Mid-year and end-of-year reports are requested of each committee to measure progress toward goals.

Consultation. Another key to shared governance is consultation with both faculty and classified staff through informal channels. The president and vice presidents meet regularly with the president and president-elect of the Academic Senate. These meetings are informal, without agendas, and are meant to anticipate issues and avoid potential problems. Because Cuesta College does not have a faculty bargaining unit, these meetings are also used to discuss faculty salaries and benefits. Classified matters, other than those reserved for collective bargaining, are worked out in informal consultation.

Evaluation. A final key to successful shared governance is thoughtful, ongoing evaluation. This evaluation is accomplished using a collegewide survey every spring, the results of which are reviewed by the college president and the president of the Academic Senate, and by conducting a workshop where representatives from all segments of the college work cooperatively to review structures and processes, including the evaluation process itself. These evaluations have resulted in committees being combined, memberships changed, and procedures, such as the way committee chairs are appointed, altered.

Even with careful planning and evaluation, shared governance requires constant nurturing. At Cuesta, all parties work to ensure old habits do not reappear when the going gets rough or personnel changes occur on committees. Overcoming distrust of the process is a continuing issue which is addressed by regularly communicating the positive results of shared governance.

Success depends upon clearly defined committee structures, well-defined roles and relationships for all committees, open and constant communication and consultation, ongoing evaluation, and broad-based participation in a strong planning and budget process.

The structure and principles of shared governance, represented by the success experienced at Cuesta College, can provide benefits to colleges that businesses have reaped for years through participatory management programs. The opportunity the process presents for gaining broad-based support, for improvement in college communications, and for more effective decision making is difficult to ignore. Through the process, individuals as well as committees share both the responsibility and the authority for making better quality decisions—decisions that are made collectively and with support from all segments of the institution.

Grace N. Mitchell is president/superintendent of Cuesta College in San Luis Obispo, California. Ann B. Grant is dean of instruction for sciences, mathematics, nursing, physical education, engineering and technology at Cuesta. Marilyn Rossa is coordinator of multicultural and women's programs, instructor in language arts, and chair of the Planning and Budget Committee at the college. Copies of the cited documents are available from the Office of the President, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-8106; (805) 546-3118.

Dr. Mitchell is also a 1988 graduate of the League-sponsored Executive Leadership Institute. Applications for the 1993 institute are now available from the League office, (714) 855-0710.

Volume 5, number 10
December 1992

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 204, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Community College Leadership Institute. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Printed on Recycled Paper